

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/723,505	11/26/2003	Dale G. Swan	SRM0006/US 8953	
7590 06/23/2006		EXAMINER		
Paul L. Weaver			NAFF, DAVID M	
Kagan Binder, PLLC Maple Island Building, Suite 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
221 Main Street North Stillwater, MN 55082			1651	:
			DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/723,505	SWAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David M. Naff	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply	/ 10 0== =0 =\/p\	0) 00 71110777 (00) 0 4) (0				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 No.	ovember 2003.					
<u>_</u>						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
dee the attached detailed office action for a fist	or the certified copies flot receive	u.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ite atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

20

25

Election/Restrictions

Claims in the application are 1-27.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-21, drawn to a composition, classified in class
 522, subclass 109.
 - II. Claims 22-25, drawn to a method of forming a compatible polymeric matrix on a surface that can be the surface of tissue or cells, classified in class 424, subclass 93.7.
 - III. Claims 26, drawn to a cellular material encapsulated with a biocompatible polymeric matrix, classified in class 435, subclass 182.
 - IV. Claim 27, drawn to a medical device coated with a polymeric matrix, classified in class 424, subclass 400.
- The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the composition of invention I can be used in a method different than required by invention II. For example the composition can be used to form a polymeric matrix in the form of particles without the

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

polymeric matrix being formed on a surface as required by invention II.

Inventions II and III, IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the cellular material of invention III and medical device of invention IV can be produced by a method different than required by invention II. For example, the cellular material of invention III and medical device of invention IV can be produced without the macromer of invention III and the polymeric material of invention IV being a polymerizable compound in combination with a polymerization initiator as required by the method of invention II.

The cellular material of invention III and medical device of invention IV are distinct since the cellular material and medical device are different such that each can be produced and used without producing and using other.

Inventions III and IV are distinct from invention I, and the converse, since the composition of invention I can be used for other than to produce the cellular material of invention III and the medical device of invention IV. For example, the composition can be used to produce polymeric particles in the absence of the cellular material and medical device of inventions III and IV. Additionally, the

Art Unit: 1651

10

15

20

25

cellular material of invention III and medical device of invention IV can be produced without a composition as required by invention I. For example, the macromer of invention III and polymeric material of invention IV do not have to be a polymerizable material as required by claim 1 of invention I, and the polymerization accelerator of inventions III and IV does not have to contain an N-vinyl group as required by claim 21 of invention I.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Searching and examining inventions I-IV together will be a serious burden since the scope of search and considerations relating to applying prior are different for each invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence

Art Unit: 1651

10

15

20

25

30

35

or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition

Application/Control Number: 10/723,505

Art Unit: 1651

against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 6

5 Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651

10

15

20